

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Jennifer Smith	Team: Squad #14	CCRB Case #: 201802918	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 04/03/2018 5:15 PM	Location of Incident: In front of § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 32	18 Mo. SOL 10/3/2019	EO SOL 10/3/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 04/13/2018 5:35 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 04/13/2018 5:35 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Kendo Kinsey	12092	938774	032 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Kendo Kinsey	Abuse: Police Officer Kendo Kinsey stopped § 87(2)(b) Jr.	
B.POM Kendo Kinsey	Discourtesy: Police Officer Kendo Kinsey spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
C.POM Kendo Kinsey	Abuse: Police Officer Kendo Kinsey searched § 87(2)(b) Jr.	

Case Summary

On April 13, 2018, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and filed this complaint on behalf of his two sons, § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) -old, and § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) -old. § 87(2)(b) did not witness this incident.

There is no video evidence in this case.

On April 19, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was called. There was no answer and a voice message was left for him. That same day, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB, confirmed his contact information, and provided a phone statement. An interview was not scheduled during that call because § 87(2)(b) was away at college. On April 24, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was called. There was no answer and one voice message was left notifying him that he had the option to send a notarized written statement to the CCRB in lieu of appearing for an in-person interview. Between May 1, 2018 and May 30, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was called four times and four voice messages were left, each reiterating that he could send a notarized statement to the CCRB in lieu of appearing for an in-person statement. Between May 1, 2018 and June 18, 2018, two unreturned letters and three unreturned emails were sent to § 87(2)(b).

On April 24, 2018, § 87(2)(b)'s mother, § 87(2)(b) was called. During that call, § 87(2)(b) said § 87(2)(b) did not wish to participate in this complaint and that all further communication regarding the complaint should be with § 87(2)(b) or directly with § 87(2)(b).

On April 19, 2018 and July 3, 2018, § 87(2)(b) was called five times. During three of those calls, there was no answer and no voice message could be left. On June 5, 2018, § 87(2)(b)'s wife, § 87(2)(b) answered and agreed to ask § 87(2)(b) to call the CCRB. On June 7, 2018, § 87(2)(b) answered again and said she had given the previous message to § 87(2)(b) that § 87(2)(b) said the CCRB should contact § 87(2)(b) regarding the complaint, and that § 87(2)(b) wanted to withdraw the complaint. Between April 19, 2018 and July 3, 2018, two unreturned letters were mailed to § 87(2)(b) and two unreturned emails were sent to him.

On July 3, 2018, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB, relayed that § 87(2)(b) should be the parent contacted regarding this complaint, and agreed to ask § 87(2)(b) to call the CCRB. However, as of the date of this report, § 87(2)(b) had failed to do so.

On July 3, 2018, New York City and New York State inmate lookup searches confirmed that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Squad No.: 14

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date